



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,063	10/29/2003	John Henry Green	CA920020091US1	5900
25259	7590	01/19/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION 3039 CROWNLAND RD. DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195 REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			CAO, DIEM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/696,063	GREEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Diem K. Cao	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



WILLIAM THOMSON
 SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code on page 2, line 27. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The current focus of the Patent Office in regard to statutory inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for method claims and claims that recite a judicial exception (software) is that the claimed invention recite a practical application. Practical application can be provided by a physical transformation or a useful, concrete and tangible result. No physical transformation is recited and additionally, the final result of the claim is "exposing properties of a given interface as data" which is not a tangible result because no result is produced from the step as claimed, and the result is not saved/stored. The following link on the World Wide Web is for the United States Patent And Trademark Office (USPTO) policy on 35 U.S.C. §101. MPEP 2107

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ola/preognnotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf>

Claim Objection

4. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 9 recites "application sever", "application server" should be used instead. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the interactionSpecProperty" in line 2, and claim 8 recites the limitation "the connectionSpecProperty" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walrath (J2EE Tutorial).**

As to claim 1, Walrath teaches exposing properties of a given interface as data (ConnectionSpec, InteractionSpec; chapter "Common Client Interface", page 1, and Instantiate a new CciConnectionSpec object with the user and password values obtained by the setSessionContext method; page 3, and iPec.setSchema (user); page 6). Examiner interprets "exposing" as the values of properties of an interface can be set or get as disclosed by Applicant.

As to claim 2, Walrath teaches the given interface is the interactionSpec (InteractionSpec; chapter "Common Client Interface", page 1, and iPec.setSchema (user); page 6).

As to claim 3, Walrath teaches the given interface is the connectionSpec (ConnectionSpec; chapter "Common Client Interface", page 1, and Instantiate a new CciConnectionSpec object with the user and password values obtained by the setSessionContext method; page 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walrath (J2EE Tutorial).**

As to claim 4, Walrath teaches receiving an input message that includes a plurality of parts (user and password values obtained by the setSessionContext method; chapter "Common Client Interface", page 3 and The session bean must pass ... stored procedure; page 7), and if a given part of the plurality of parts is determined to be an instance of the property of the given interface, setting a value from the given part into the given interface, thereby exposing a property of the given interface as data (iSpec.setSchema (user), iSpec.setCatalog (null); pages 6-7).

Walrath does not explicitly teach determining whether any of the plurality of parts are instances of property of a given interface. However, prior to set those values to an interface, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the values must be validated as to know whether the passed in values are intended values for the interface. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add the extra step to avoid any runtime error that may occur.

As to claim 5, see rejection of claim 2 above.

As to claim 6, Walrath teaches the property of the given interface is the interactionSpecProperty (iSpec.setFunctionName("COUNTCOFFEE"); page 6).

As to claim 7, see rejection of claim 3 above.

As to claim 8, the property of the given interface is the connectionSpecProperty (user and password values obtained by the setSessionContext method; chapter "Common Client Interface", page 3).

As to claims 9 and 10, they are the same as the method claim of claim 4 except they are computer products claims, and are rejected under the same ground of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197. (toll-free).

DC

January 8, 2007

WILLIAM THOMSON
SPT OF US PATENT EXAMINER
TELECOMMUNICATIONS CENTER 2100